



Undergraduate assignment feedback form
(to be completed by marker)

Student Name: Shane Newbury	
Module title: Phronomology & Existentialism	Student number:
For completion by marker:	
Comments: While this essay reveals knowledge of relevant facts, concepts & argument, there is a lack of attention to the detail of the claims at stake, & there is little evidence that the primary reading material has been closely read (this is one explanation for the fact that there are serious lapses in referencing). You need to provide references throughout (full references, including pg. nos). Further, there is little evidence of engaged secondary reading — use of such reading material could enable you to	
Marker's signature: [Signature]	Date: 27/11/19
Provisional mark: 54	
NB. All marks are provisional until confirmed by the final examination board.	

present a much more detailed & precise answer to the question
 SH

Name → please provide.
Write your name on all essays
in future.
(Shane Newbery)

What does Sartre mean when he contends that humans are condemned to be free?

Revised
During the age of the ancient world all the way through to the age of contemporary philosophy, questions concerning 'how should we live' ^{have} been of the utmost importance to philosophers. Jean Paul Sartre, Martin Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty to name but a few, have been recognized amongst others, giving light to this topic of enquiry, creating a branch of philosophy of their own, called Existentialism. One of the most popular and adored philosophers to this day is Jean Paul Sartre, and his writings such as Being and Nothingness. Gr. { The key points Sartre makes in his philosophy is that there is no God and that humans are a different type of being in comparison to other beings in the world, as they are conscious, and this consciousness gives humans the act of choice. This results in the person having agency over themselves to create value and meaning, culminating the position in life where they are condemned to be free. In this essay I will give a detailed description of Sartre's philosophy and then furthermore gives examples explaining his understanding on 'how we should live' by what he terms as 'condemned to be free'. In light of Sartre's account on humans being condemned to be free, I will then present some criticisms against Sartre, from the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. (Sartre 2007)

Could you use original source?

Born in Paris, Sartre proved he was a gifted student, and gained entry into the prestigious, Ecole Normale Supérieure. It was there he met his lifelong partner and fellow philosopher Simone de Beauvoir. Afterwards, he worked as a teacher and was made a professor of philosophy at the university of Le Havre in 1931. During world war 2, Sartre was recruited into the army and eventually imprisoned. In prison he continued to study Heidegger's philosophy. Released one year later, he returned to Paris and to his post of a teacher of philosophy. Shortly after Sartre's release in 1941, he joined the resistance movement. After 1945, Sartre's writing became very political and he went on to found the literary and political journal Modern Times. He was offered, however declined the Nobel prize for literature in 1964. Sartre's influence and popularity had such an effect, that more than 50,000 people attend his funeral in 1980 (Flynn 2013). Sartre's philosophical contention that human beings are condemned to be free begins with his foundations of his philosophy in phenomenology and existentialism. After studying Husserl and Heidegger, Sartre took a different approach from Heidegger's being-in-the-world perspective (Heidegger 1962), that is to say the starting point for philosophical enquiry is not that of subjects knowing objects but as beings that already existing in the world, before becoming a subject knowing an object at all. Alternatively, Sartre sets the groundwork for his enquiry in accordance with the subject in relation to an object, taking a Cartesian methodology as his indubitable place to

References needed throughout →
inc. pg. nos.

start. Sartre's Cartesian methodology lead him to assert that it was because humans are conscious, as he states beings-for-itself (pour-soi), we are therefore separate and different types of beings from say trees, rocks and other objects, what he terms 'being-in-itself' (en-soi). For Sartre, this consciousness then is the indubitable starting point. In light of this, Sartre believes consciousness is essentially 'nothing,' and that leads him to the understanding that consciousness has a key function and that is 'choice'. Additionally, Sartre's atheism plays a significant role in his philosophy, his premise of god means no god created human beings and therefore human beings do not have any structured blueprint built into their being, causally effecting an intended essence before their existence. Reflecting on this remark, that existence precedes essence is at the core of Sartre's argument for how human beings are condemned to freedom. He gives a famous illustration of this distinction in the following example. He asks us to imagine a paper knife – the kind of knife that might be used to open an envelope. This knife has been made by a craftsman who has had the idea of creating such a tool and had a clear understanding of what is required of a paperknife. It needs to be sharp enough to cut through paper, but not too sharp to be dangerous. It needs to be easy to wield, made of an appropriate substance- metal, bamboo or wood, perhaps, but not butter, wax or feathers – and fashioned to function efficiently. Sartre says that it is inconceivable for a paperknife to exist without its maker knowing what it is going to be used for. Therefore the essence of a paper-knife – or all the things that make it a paperknife and not a steak knife or a paper aeroplane – comes before the existence of any particular paperknife. humans, of course, are not paper knives. For Sartre, there is no preordained plan or a set blueprint that makes us the kind of beings that we are. We are not made for any particular purpose or essence like a paper knife does; our existence precedes our essence.

Ditto. Taking this into account, it is only by human beings not having the essence defined; as humans are beings-for-itself and not being-in-itself (trees, rocks and other objects) and god did not create us, we therefore have an agency to create and shape our essence ourselves through our choices. Effectively, imagination is a fundamental faculty human beings have that allows us to imagine what might be, and through exercising your imagination of what might be, opens up people's minds to possibilities that could happen and therefore creating opportunities of freedom through action. As well as imagination, choices are central to Sartre's philosophy in creating freedom because it is through our recognition of our choices, we feel as though we have a control and power over the situation we find ourselves in. These choices that we have can be present in almost all situations we face in our everyday life's Sartre argues. And it is due to this lack of acknowledgement of our choices we always have, that creates a paradigmatic view of the world of being imprisoned by other people and situations. Freedom, Sartre argues, is an inescapable part of being human, because we all have consciousness and a key function of consciousness is choice, we consequently are always in a position of ability to make choices

which gives us our freedom to do what we want. Even though our choices are limited in a sense we cannot choose our genetics, parents and country of birth, we can however, make choices within the boundaries of these components of facticity. And that for Sartre is more than enough for human beings to be free. Consequentially, for Sartre, responsibility is the resulting factor of the freedom we achieve. Because being human is purely down to the choices we live by, this new-found position of power also creates a position of opportunity, duty and liability: opportunity due to the choice we make are constrained to the limits of your imagination, duty due to the cause and effect you will have on others and the contribution towards the situation, liability due to the choices you make will be your own and not forced upon you. For Sartre, angst is also understood as anxiety and dread, and it comes into response of the responsibility we face up to in life. Sartre believes this responsibility is also a burden and not just a positive and freeing state. Essentially, this responsibility that comes with freedom causes the person to worry about the fact they get things wrong and cause more problems, potentially making situations worse for others and themselves.

✓ Bad faith, for Sartre, is when a person who comes to the realization of their position of freedom and then choose to make an *excuse* instead of facing up to responsibility and angst that follows it. They escape their dread and anxiety by lying to themselves, making out that they do not have a choice in the matter and therefore lose their freedom in the process. The following famous waiter example demonstrates what Sartre means here, "his movement is quick and forward, a little too precise, a little too rapid. He comes toward the patrons with a step a little too quick, he bends forward a little too eagerly; his voice, his eyes express an interest a little too solicitous for the order of the customer. Finally there he returns, trying to imitate in his walk the flexible stiffness of some kind of automaton while carrying his tray with the recklessness of a tightrope walker by putting it in a perpetually unstable, perpetually broken equilibrium which he perpetually re-establishes by a light movement of the hand and arm." (J.-P. Sartre 1958)

✓ Sartre's philosophy is commonly misunderstood as that of a pessimistic one, due to its representation of limited choices, angst and responsibility, however, Sartre's perspective was more of an optimistic one. He explains this by his cases of authenticity, stressing that even though we are burdened with limited choices, angst and responsibility, this position enables us to form our essence, giving us the ability to create our individuality. Furthermore, individuality is not only the positive outcome of the burdensome components of being human but the most important part of life, as it gives us the opportunity to live a life of authenticity. A life of authenticity, Sartre asserts, is living a life that can overcome the existential dread of being a human being, as it adds value to one's own life in terms of dignity. Dignity, on the grounds that, irrespective of the situation we are born into, it is

References needed.

through our authentic being we can grow ourselves with what we find value in, for example moral worth and respectability. Value and meaning for Sartre is central to creating ourselves, because as we go about our everyday lives making choices, the choices we make, create value and through making value of things and actions, we in doing so effect the type of person we become. After all, a human being to Sartre is essentially nothing, all that exists at your centre is an ability to choose. As a result, freedom is the highest value for Sartre, as he exclaims that all value comes from free choice, to value anything is to value the thing that gives it value. For example, if you value courage, you have to value the thing that brings about the courage and that is free choice.

One criticism for Sartre is Martin Heidegger. Heidegger's philosophy of the existential structure of human life differs from Sartre's, basically because he works from an unself-conscious level, which is fundamental to his conception of the 'lived world'. Although in opposition to Sartre, Heidegger doesn't deny that there is some level of self-conscious deliberation and decision, and it is in the situation of this feature of human life that he applies his distinction within 'inauthenticity and 'authenticity'. Heidegger's argument here brings tension with Sartre's philosophy, as Heidegger's philosophy looks back to Kierkegaard's ideology, saying that it is an achievement to become an individual, the basic idea is those whose understanding of themselves is not informed by grasping the true nature of their individual existence, who's understanding of themselves as just complex animals, are said to only live an inauthentic existence; whereas those embodied the truth of Heidegger's philosophy of their existence and are able to regulate their lives in accordance with it, are believed to have attained authenticity. In conflict with Sartre, Heidegger proposes that we always begin with an inauthentic conception of ourselves. What then motivates and urges us to become authentic is our experience and understanding of angst, which Heidegger interprets as an awareness of the restlessness of a life of goals and values, which are not understood as originating from the structure of one's own existence. Angst, consequently then, recalls us to ourselves, and by making the existential structure of our life's accessible to us, helping to guide us to an authentic appreciation of our freedom. Heidegger connects this experience of 'angst' with one's attitude to one's own death. In effect, this attitude is typically one of death, because the connection of death is the end of one's existence, thus, an authentic life is 'an impassioned freedom towards death'.

For He, the 'herd mentality' is a normal way of being.

Lastly, Heidegger's existentialism is ultimately metaphysical. He even denies the inauthentic-authentic distinction has any ethical composition. Sartre, by contrast, definitively presents existentialism as an ethical doctrine. He predominantly takes his existential starting point from Heidegger, however, where Heidegger clearly separates human existence from the act of choice, Sartre maintains the position as one in which the act of choice in life is fundamental. Sartre furthermore clashes with Heidegger, arguing that

we choose our emotions and feelings as much as any other part of our life, and that the basic goals of our lives are in accord around a 'original choice,' since it provides us with all the motivation's we have.

or individual's choice. ?

In conclusion, Sartre puts forward a few notable convincing arguments, firstly, of how consciousness is a distinctive factor in amongst being and that its key functionality is choice, which ultimately sets the foundation for the burdensome aspects of one's life and existence; angst, facticity contained choices, responsibility. Secondly, how a person can attain an optimistic life only through confronting bad faith, reaching out possibilities, bringing a prosperous authentic life through values and meaning, condemning us to freedom. However, on the other hand, Heidegger's philosophy presents Sartre's shortcomings, as his account of authenticity brings more significance and clarity to the notions of everyday angst and how we experience and co-exist with it through not having a true connection with our natural state of existence. Finally, Heidegger suggests that the inauthentic authentic distinction is not in relation to an ethical grounding but a metaphysical one, as he separates human existence and the significance that the role of choice has in effect.

Good conclusion

Bibliography

Flynn, Thomas. 2013. "Jean-Paul Sartre." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2013 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed).

Heidegger. 1962. *Being and Time*. London: Harper & Row.

Sartre. 2007. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Yale University Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1958. *Being and Nothingness*. London: Methuen.



